



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

TK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,084	08/05/2003	Gillis E. Onyeabor	4407-A1C	7227
29370	7590	06/22/2006	EXAMINER	
ROBERT A. PARSONS 4000 N. CENTRAL AVENUE, SUITE 1220 PHOENIX, AZ 85012			ROCHE, TRENTON J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/635,084	ONYEABOR, GILLIS E.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Trenton J. Roche	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 38-56 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 38-55 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 56 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed 5 August 2003 and 22 September 2003.
2. Per Applicant's request, amended claim 1 has been entered. Claims 2-37 have been canceled. Newly added claims 38-56 have been entered. Claims 1 and 38-56 are currently pending and have been examined.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claim 56 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 38-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,835,712 to DuFresne in view of U.S. Patent 6,353,839 to King et al. (hereinafter "King").

### **Per claim 1:**

DuFresne discloses:

- a server-side computer; a client-side computer coupled to receive a web page document from the server-side computer for displaying a web page corresponding to the web page document ("When a client makes a request for a particular Web page controlled by the Web server 20, the server processes the request...and returns the page to the client for display..." in col. 6 lines 29-33)
- the web page document including information describing one or more database-related components included on the webpage ("...each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain..." in col. 9 lines 51-53)
- event-driven code associated with the one or more database-related components, the event-driven code being executed by the client-side computer which displays the webpage page ("scripts update databases...scripts can be tied to action buttons on an HTML display..." in col. 16 lines 19-26)
- the event-driven code being capable of creating and sending, the server-side computer, an information request to access a remote set of data, which is stored in a remote database that is assessable to the server-side computer ("scripts update databases..." in col. 16 lines 19-20)
- wherein execution of the event-driven code causes the client-side computer to determine criteria that describes the remote set of data based on state variables, and to include the criteria in the information request (Note col. 20 lines 8-36)

substantially as claimed. While DuFresne discloses that state variables may be stored on the client side via the active web page ("embeds state information in each Web page..." in col. 20 line 5), DuFresne does not explicitly disclose state variables being created and maintained on the client-side computer. King discloses in an analogous client/server communication system the ability to create and maintain client/server state variables on the client side ("a user of an HTML client can create

state information by setting HTML form fields..." in col. 6 lines 24-25) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of DuFresne such that state information is created and maintained by the client as discloses by King, as this would solve the problem of using client state in displays without the necessity of the round-trip to a server and incurring all the complexity of a scripting language, as noted by King in col. 7 lines 1-4.

**Per claim 38:**

DuFresne further discloses causing a portion of the remote set of data to be displayed as claimed (Note col. 18 lines 38-40)

**Per claim 39:**

DuFresne further discloses report generation code as claimed (Note col. 18 lines 38-40. The returned web page is a report of the data operation.)

**Per claim 40:**

DuFresne further discloses a monitor for displaying the web page, a user input for inputting development information, and a web page development processor as claimed (Note Figure 3A and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

**Per claim 41:**

DuFresne further discloses a server-side computer including a communication apparatus that receives a first message from, and sends a second message to, the client-side computer as claimed (Note Figure 14, item 300 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

**Per claim 42:**

DuFresne further discloses data storage coupled to the processor for storing the remote set of data as claimed (Note Figure 14, item 300. Further, “manages information stored under its control...” in col. 6 line 23)

**Per claim 43:**

Note the rejections regarding claims 1 and 40, and further note at least Figure 1 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure. The client is connected to a local area network, and consequently has a communication apparatus.

**Per claims 44 and 45:**

DuFresne further discloses encryption and description as claimed (“processed through an encrypted URL...” in col. 19 line 37)

**Per claim 46:**

Note the rejection regarding claim 1. As DuFresne discloses the ability to embed state information in web pages which will be displayed by the client computer, the client computer must then, at some point, store the state variables, however temporarily, along with the associated web page document.

**Per claims 47 and 48:**

Note the rejection regarding claims 1, 40, 41 and 43.

**Per claims 49 and 50:**

Note the rejection regarding claims 44 and 45, respectively.

**Per claim 51:**

Note the rejection regarding claim 46.

**Per claim 52:**

Note the rejection regarding claims 1 and 38.

**Per claim 53:**

Note the rejection regarding claim 41.

**Per claims 54 and 55:**

DuFresne further discloses requesting a second web page from the server-side computer and displaying the second web page simultaneously with the first page as claimed (Note Figure 14 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure. The web browser is capable of displaying a second web page.)

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trenton J. Roche whose telephone number is (571) 272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Trenton J Roche  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2193

TJR

*xas - m.*  
KAKALI CHAKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100